

SCOPING AND INFORMATIONAL MEETING

LITTLE FALLS - APRIL 26, 2016 - 6:00 P.M.

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

AND DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

In the Matter of the Application of North Dakota Pipeline Company, LLC for a Certificate of Need for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota

PUC DOCKET NO: CN-13-473

In the Matter of the Application of North Dakota Pipeline Company, LLC for a Pipeline Routing Permit for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota

PUC DOCKET NO: PPL-13-474

In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership for a Certificate of Need for the Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project in Minnesota from the North Dakota Border to the Wisconsin Border

PUC DOCKET NO: CN-14-916

In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership for a Route Permit for the Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project in Minnesota from the North Dakota Border to the Wisconsin Border

PUC DOCKET NO: PPL-15-137

The Falls Ballroom
15870 Minnesota 27
Little Falls, Minnesota

COURT REPORTER: Janet Shaddix Elling, RPR

I N D E X - L I T T L E F A L L S

SPEAKER	PAGE
Robin Hensel	4
Jamie MacAlister	9
Gregory Johnson	20
Claire Steen	25
Mary Johnson	27
Cynthia Janes	30
Robert Morgan	32
Mary Johnson	37
Mike Franklin	39
Unidentified	42
Mary Johnson	43
Lynn Englehorn	44
Mary Johnson	45
Colleen LeBlanc	46
Chuck Parins	47
Jerry Ryan	50

1 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: If I could have
2 your attention again. This is a little slightly
3 different version of the announcement that I made
4 earlier, primarily for those that came in after
5 6:00. This time between 6:00 and 7:00 is an open
6 house when you can ask questions to the various
7 personnel. Enbridge is over here, the state staff
8 are over on this side here.

9 One thing that I didn't make note of
10 before, for roughly about the next half hour the
11 court reporter will take comments if you would like
12 to make them privately to her. They will still
13 become part of the minutes for the meeting tonight,
14 but if you don't feel comfortable in making your
15 statement in front of a large group, this is your
16 opportunity to speak to Janet, the court reporter.
17 So if anyone would like to come up and make
18 comments, just come up here and she'll be happy to
19 take your comments.

20 And then again at 7:00 we'll start with
21 the formal program. We'll do a welcome, we'll go
22 through process, there will be a brief presentation,
23 and then after that we will take members of the
24 public comments.

25 The only other piece is just simply a

1 reminder. The yellow folder is your key piece. If
2 you would like to make a public comment, other than
3 private ones, during the public comment period, we
4 need to have you fill out the green card. You can
5 get those out at the desk.

6 Anybody have any questions? Thank you
7 very much.

8 (Break.)

9 (Private comment.)

10 MS. ROBIN HENSEL: Robin, R-O-B-I-N,
11 Hensel. Do you want my middle name too?

12 COURT REPORTER: No. How do you spell
13 your last name?

14 MS. ROBIN HENSEL: Hensel, H-E-N-S-E-L.

15 COURT REPORTER: Okay.

16 MS. ROBIN HENSEL: And just a question
17 before I make my statement.

18 Is this to stop this pipeline? Or to
19 stop it from moving? Or -- I can't stay for the
20 presentation because I have to be on a conference
21 call.

22 (Discussion between Jamie MacAlister and
23 Robin Hensel off the record.)

24 MS. ROBIN HENSEL: Okay. So I have
25 concerns about groundwater quality, potential leaks,

1 spills, the environmental hazards associated with
2 transporting oil in any fashion.

3 I am concerned about tribal rights
4 issues. Human rights by our Native community
5 members.

6 I'm concerned about air contamination in
7 the event of a spill, as Little Falls, south of
8 Little Falls we experienced a pipeline break and oil
9 was spewing everywhere in a big area along
10 Highway -- the highway headed towards St. Cloud.
11 And my home is located in close proximity to that
12 and the fumes were very noxious.

13 I am concerned about a potential spill
14 and the cleanup of that, where it would be disposed
15 of. Here it was put into the Morrison County
16 landfill. They used a big liner of some sort,
17 rubber or plastic or something and put it in our
18 landfill. There are concerns with that as well
19 eventually leaking into our groundwater.

20 And I am quite aware as a citizen monitor
21 of Little Elk River, close to Randall, that our
22 entire watershed is impaired at this point. The
23 Mississippi River in this area is impaired, Little
24 Elk River that I monitor is impaired, as well as a
25 number of tributaries that lead into the

1 Mississippi. So we have great water concerns in the
2 Little Falls/Morrison County area. And that's it.

3 (Break.)

4 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: I think we are
5 going to start a few minutes before 7:00 with the
6 formal program. So if anyone would like to come and
7 make comments, you have a few minutes, this is your
8 time to do it with Janet, to do it privately.

9 Also, if you would like to comment during
10 the public comment time, we need a green card, so if
11 you can hand in your green cards it would be
12 appreciated.

13 Thank you very much. We'll probably get
14 going again in about five minutes.

15 (Break.)

16 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Just a last call
17 for green cards. If anybody has a green card, if
18 any of you would like to provide public comment
19 during that period of the meeting, we do need a
20 green card. So if you would like to make comments,
21 please hand it in to me or to the folks out in the
22 entryway. We'll get going in just a couple seconds.

23 (Break.)

24 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Welcome. This is
25 the second meeting of 12 public comment meetings

1 that we're going to have on the Sandpiper Pipeline
2 and Line 3. We'd like to welcome you and thank you
3 very much for coming out tonight, you taking time
4 away from busy schedules.

5 I'll go through the process and then
6 Jamie will do a brief presentation on the pipelines
7 that we are talking about.

8 Thank you. Great. At least it's not the
9 squeal past that.

10 We do have ground rules that we'll be
11 operating from. I think I can do this. A series of
12 three, six, seven, eight ground rules. The bottom
13 line is basically mutual respect, courtesy, and
14 patience. So we can hear your concepts or so we can
15 hear your thoughts on the alternatives, the issues,
16 and the analysis to be included in the environmental
17 impact statement. So that's the key focus.

18 Secondly, please help me maintain an
19 atmosphere where everyone feels comfortable and
20 welcome.

21 Third, please don't interrupt anyone when
22 they're speaking at the table, this is their time to
23 be able to provide their comments and get them in
24 the meeting minutes.

25 Please remain quiet so others and the

1 court reporter can hear. Which is -- I'm going to
2 introduce Janet. She is the court reporter. And
3 she is the most important person in the room, from
4 my standpoint, and probably from your standpoint
5 also. She is the one who's going to be gathering
6 and capturing your comments. She needs to hear. If
7 she can't hear, she's going to throw something at me
8 or scowl at me or get mad at me and I'll have to say
9 something. So the bottom line is let's keep Janet
10 with that smile on her face through the night. That
11 will make everybody happy out of this.

12 No signs, banners, we're good with that.

13 When you're commenting up here, please
14 refrain from addressing the audience, from turning
15 around, asking a show of hands, I request that you
16 don't do that.

17 The other bottom line is cell phones,
18 please turn them off or turn them to the silent
19 buzz.

20 With -- I think we had five green cards,
21 so five people that would like to speak. We will
22 have plenty of time to be able to cover those so
23 we'll probably allow folks roughly about five
24 minutes to make public comments.

25 I do have a timer up here, which I'll try

1 and position so both the person making the comment
2 and myself can see. I'll give you a two-minute mark
3 warning and a one-minute warning. And I'll go over
4 those before we go through the public comment piece.

5 I think with that I'm going to be quiet
6 and turn it over to Jamie MacAlister. She's the
7 Environmental Review Manager at the Department of
8 Commerce. She will do a brief presentation on the
9 two lines, the pipelines we're talking about, and
10 also talk about the purpose for the meeting and the
11 process that we go through.

12 Any process questions from anybody?

13 Janet, did I screw anything up?

14 All right. Jamie, I'll let you go.

15 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Good evening,
16 everyone. Thank you for coming.

17 I'm Jamie MacAlister with the Department
18 of Commerce, Energy Environmental Review and
19 Analysis. Is that better? No? I'll do my best.
20 Is that better?

21 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

22 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Okay. So we are
23 here this evening for the scoping meeting for the
24 Sandpiper pipeline and the Line 3 replacement
25 pipeline.

1 Hopefully you've had a chance to speak
2 with some of the technical staff that are here
3 tonight. We do have technical staff from DNR,
4 Minnesota DNR, the Minnesota Pollution Control
5 Agency, and the Public Utilities Commission. So if
6 you have specific questions that you need to ask our
7 technical staff, please utilize them while they're
8 here.

9 Let's see. What else can I tell you?
10 You should all have picked up a yellow folder when
11 you came in. And in your folder, in addition to a
12 copy of the presentation, which is important because
13 it has a lot of useful information on the back page.
14 It has contact information as well as web
15 information, how to get in touch with me, how to
16 comment online. You should have a comment form
17 which you can send in or leave here with us, in
18 addition to making comment this evening.

19 There should be also be a guide to how
20 you can help us to submit -- or how to submit
21 alternative routes and route segments. That's,
22 again, that's a guide, but it does help us in
23 understanding any route or segment alternative that
24 you may wish to provide us. We've also provided
25 some evaluation criteria, and a table of contents

1 for how we think the EIS is going to be laid out at
2 this point.

3 You should also have a couple of maps.
4 One showing the route alternatives and one showing
5 what has been termed previously as system
6 alternatives. If you're missing any of that
7 information, please see the folks at the front table
8 and they will help you get any information that you
9 may not have.

10 So I wanted to briefly go over the
11 regulatory framework. For those of you that have
12 been involved in this process for the last couple of
13 years, it's gotten more complicated than it was
14 previously.

15 So for the certificate of need aspect of
16 these projects, those are governed by Minnesota
17 Statutes 216B and Rule 7853. We also have the
18 routing statutes, 216G, Minnesota Rules 7852. And
19 the EIS for both the certificate of need and the
20 route permit will be prepared according to Minnesota
21 Rule 4410. And as well there will be contested case
22 hearings after the environmental impact statement
23 determination of adequacy has been completed.

24 So the purpose of these scoping meetings
25 is really to give tribes and the public and local

1 units of government the opportunity to help us
2 identify issues and impacts that need to be covered
3 in the environmental impact statement. To help and
4 participate in the development of any route segment
5 alternatives. And to help us develop what will
6 be -- we will take all these comments and develop a
7 final scope for this project, that is what the EIS
8 will be based on.

9 And as you may know, for those of you
10 that have followed any of the Sandpiper proceedings
11 and possibly Line 3, we are on the third round of
12 scoping meetings. So we've had over 30 scoping
13 meetings on both of these projects previously. Some
14 of you may be here this evening because you received
15 a notice in the mail regarding a particular system
16 alternative that is coming through this area. That
17 was proposed during the Sandpiper proceeding, and
18 all the alternatives that have been proposed
19 previously are currently under consideration moving
20 forward into the EIS. It's possible that not all of
21 those alternatives will end up being considered.
22 That's why we provided you with the criteria, the
23 evaluation criteria for these alternatives.

24 So while we've been out here we had a lot
25 of people telling us what they're concerned about.

1 So some of these are ground and surface water
2 concerns, concerns about spills, wild rice, pipeline
3 decommissioning, jobs and local economies, and
4 climate change. So we have heard many of these
5 issues and we're trying to get additional issues
6 that you think are important for us to be looking
7 at.

8 So we've been up here, we've been having
9 all these scoping meetings and tribal technical
10 meetings and agency coordination meetings. In
11 developing the draft scoping document, we're kind of
12 wondering what have we overlooked. So hopefully
13 you're here tonight to tell us what we have not
14 already captured.

15 So just briefly. We're here, the public
16 information and scoping meetings, there's going to
17 be a very long process before any decision is made
18 on these projects. There will be a final scoping
19 decision that needs to be approved by the Public
20 Utilities Commission. There will be the draft EIS
21 and a final EIS, and then contested case hearings,
22 and a determination on whether or not these projects
23 will be permitted.

24 And along with all these other meetings,
25 there are still a couple more public comment points

1 here for the draft EIS and then going into the
2 contested case hearings.

3 So what goes into developing this EIS?
4 We take a lot of information from a lot of people.
5 Local governments, tribal governments, other
6 interested parties, working with our sister agencies
7 here, and all that information helps us develop the
8 EIS. That, in turn, informs the Minnesota Public
9 Utilities Commission, who ultimately makes this
10 decision.

11 So if you have the maps, this shows all
12 the system alternatives that have been proposed
13 previously, and then the route alternatives that
14 are -- it's difficult to tell, but there's quite a
15 large cluster of routes to the east, and in all
16 there's over 50 route alternatives that were
17 proposed during the Sandpiper project, as well as
18 some additional ones during the Line 3 scoping
19 meetings.

20 So the schedule is very preliminary at
21 this point, 'cause there's still many things that
22 we're not sure how the schedule will play out.
23 Particularly in terms of how long it will take to
24 have a final scope prepared and approved.

25 But we expect a draft EIS early in 2017,

1 draft EIS public meetings shortly thereafter. A
2 final EIS in the late spring of 2017, with an
3 adequacy determination in the summer of 2017. And
4 possibly route permit decisions by the fall of 2017.
5 But, again, the schedule is very preliminary and is
6 very subject to change at this point.

7 So most of you are here probably to
8 provide us with some comments. You can do that
9 verbally here tonight with Janet. You can also send
10 your comments in to me, you can provide them online,
11 you can fax them to me, any number of ways. But
12 however you want to get your comment to me, just
13 make sure I get it by May 26th and we'll have it in
14 the record.

15 So, with that, I'm going to turn this
16 over to Charlie.

17 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Will you stand for
18 some questions of clarity if folks have any?

19 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes, questions of
20 clarity.

21 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: A question again
22 of clarity? Something you didn't understand what
23 Jamie stated or were up on the slides? Anybody?

24 Okay. Let's go --

25 UNIDENTIFIED: I just had one question.

1 It lays out, you know, all of those steps, but is
2 this cast in stone? Or what if, you know, during
3 one of the steps something different shows up that
4 hasn't been up here, then is that just adjusted,
5 then?

6 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes. This is why
7 the schedule is very preliminary. We've done our
8 best to anticipate if everything were a go, follow
9 it stepwise, a linear progression we expect it to go
10 or something like that. I'm not sure we expect it
11 to go like that, quite frankly, but we've made an
12 effort to try and provide some -- what we think are
13 reasonable estimates, time estimates.

14 UNIDENTIFIED: But there could be
15 changes?

16 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes. I anticipate
17 that there will be changes to the schedule.
18 However, we did our best to try and lay out
19 something that could reasonably be completed in the
20 amount of time. We have 280 days to complete the
21 EIS once that notice goes out. So we've done our
22 best to make sure we can complete our portion of
23 this in 280 days.

24 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: If you couldn't
25 figure out from Jamie's answer, this question was

1 about the schedule and how tight that is and a
2 question of clarity.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Why 280 days? Is that
4 something that's mandated?

5 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes, that's what
6 the rule in Minnesota 4410 says, that we have to
7 have an EIS within 280 days.

8 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Any other
9 questions of clarity?

10 Okay. Let's get into the public comment
11 time.

12 Again, the bottom line is, as we talked
13 up here, we want to hear your thoughts on the
14 alternatives, issues, analysis that goes into the
15 environmental impact statement.

16 Just an observation from the meeting last
17 night. People came up and were supporting or
18 opposed to the pipelines, and that's fine, but
19 that's not necessarily the intention. We're here to
20 hear your thoughts, we're hear to gather
21 information. That's the bottom line aspect from us
22 on this.

23 The three sort of broad questions that
24 we're looking for, and these are only guidelines,
25 but just to be thinking about. What human and

1 environmental impacts of the proposed pipeline
2 should be studied in the environmental impact
3 statement? Are there any specific methods to
4 address these impacts, whether to avoid, minimize,
5 or mitigate? And then, lastly, there are
6 alternative routes proposed that Jamie identified on
7 the map, and some criteria have been developed to
8 consider those routes. Are there additional
9 criteria or what criteria should be used in looking
10 at the routing aspect?

11 Again, a comment before we are here to
12 hear your thoughts. We've gone through the multiple
13 ways that you can make public comment. This is only
14 one way, the oral public comment here. All of these
15 comments will get into the minutes whether they're
16 written, whether they're oral, whether they're
17 emailed in, et cetera, et cetera, and they're all
18 equal. It's not better to email it in or not better
19 to verbally provide it in, they're all equal, they
20 will all get into the document.

21 We have five cards here of people that
22 would like to make comment. I'll do this in sort of
23 baseball fashion, I'll go in order that's here, with
24 the first person up, the second person is on deck,
25 the third person is in the hole. You've got to come

1 up with something.

2 Again, we'll put a five-minute time frame
3 on making comments. I'll put the clock over so we
4 can both see it. I'll give you a two-minute
5 warning, I'll give you a one-minute warning, when
6 the time is up I'll ask you to please complete your
7 thought. And hopefully we can respect that
8 five-minute time frame.

9 There will be an opportunity, because
10 we've got time tonight, for the folks who'd like to
11 come back and make a second comment, we will allow
12 that to happen, but only after everybody has gone
13 through the process.

14 I think that's it. I'm going to look
15 back to you, Janet. Anything I missed?

16 COURT REPORTER: No.

17 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: All right. Give
18 me a couple second to just move some things around.
19 There's a microphone at the table and,
20 unfortunately, it is a -- it's not tethered, so work
21 around with that, it shouldn't provide feedback
22 issues, and I'll get stuff started here.

23 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Can you remind
24 them to just turn it on when they come up?

25 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Yes. Thank you.

1 The first person up is Gregory Johnson,
2 the person that's on deck is Claire Steen, and the
3 third person on deck is Mary Johnson.

4 MR. GREGORY JOHNSON: My name is Gregory
5 Johnson, G-R-E-G-O-R-Y, J-O-H-N-S-O-N.

6 I live north of the city of Pine River.
7 I'm a board member of the Pine River Watershed
8 Alliance and serve on the Conservation Committee of
9 the Leech Lake Area Watershed Foundation to
10 coordinate the activities of the two groups for land
11 preservation and watershed protection. We're in the
12 final stages of preparation of the WRAP for the
13 watershed.

14 The Pine River Watershed has been
15 designated the number one watershed in the state for
16 water quality and for protection of both source
17 water and drinking water for Minnesota citizens.
18 The groups mentioned plus the National Forest
19 Service, The Nature Conservancy, the Minnesota Board
20 of Water and Soil Resources, lake associations and
21 others are seeking ways to protect and preserve this
22 watershed.

23 With regard to the scoping the EAW by the
24 DOC, I have a number of comments to make.

25 First I'd like to say that I am not

1 opposed to pipelines. Because of my involvement with
2 and the knowledge I have of this watershed and the
3 fact that Enbridge's proposed route crosses the
4 entire watershed, I strongly oppose the route
5 selected by Enbridge. Their scoping documents do
6 not state that a complete and thorough EIS was
7 mandated by court action and I think that should be
8 in a central part of your document.

9 The Enbridge corridor is not a Minnesota
10 project. It's a multi-state project, and according
11 to Minnesota Statute 4410.2100, sub 4, when it is
12 multiple projects and multiple stages of a single
13 project that are connected actions or phased
14 actions, they must be considered in total when
15 determining the need for an EIS and in preparing the
16 EIS.

17 This project includes Canada, North
18 Dakota, Wisconsin, potentially South Dakota,
19 Nebraska, Iowa, and states further south to the Gulf
20 Coast, perhaps with export beyond that. Therefore,
21 it needs to be completed with all appropriate state
22 and federal authorities involved as required by NEPA
23 and MEPA.

24 The scoping document needs to be clear
25 about the purpose of this project. What is the

1 public purpose? We know the private purpose and the
2 economic incentives for Enbridge to site the project
3 in the corridor they propose. But EQB states
4 clearly that, quote, in applying exclusion criteria,
5 the RGU must not be overly restrictive in defining
6 the project's purpose and need. Occasionally an RGU
7 will claim desirable but nonessential elements as
8 part of the project's purpose and need, thus
9 eliminating alternatives that should be included.
10 In many cases, these are cost-related factors and,
11 while important, they cannot overrule environmental
12 considerations.

13 The scoping DSDD states on page 15, 4.3,
14 quote, no field data will be collected and that the
15 applicant's field data will be used, end quote. Has
16 this data been scientifically verified and validated
17 by an outside, independent, reputable organization
18 or is this again pro-Enbridge bias? Does the
19 applicant's field data include all five alternate
20 routes that have been proposed by other public
21 entities? Does Enbridge's data meet the criteria
22 necessary for a complete and scientifically sound
23 EIS that delineates risks, including long-term
24 health of this critical watershed? I think not, due
25 to the overwhelming self-interest, not public

1 interest, of a private company. The RGU for this
2 project should be an agency with the scientific
3 knowledge and with the experience in doing a
4 comprehensive EIS. I don't think that is the DOC.

5 I would like to come back and finish my
6 comments later, if I may.

7 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Thank you. In all
8 honesty, do you have much left? Why don't you go
9 ahead and complete it. Are folks comfortable with
10 him completing his comments? Okay. I'll still --

11 MR. GREGORY JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

12 On page 13 the scoping document states,
13 quote, the Pine River facility will be improved, end
14 quote. To my knowledge, there are no pipelines
15 currently in the Pine River area. Was this facility
16 recently constructed by Enbridge and, if so, did
17 they have a prior approval from DOC or PUC?

18 The scoping document gives one brief
19 mention of colocation of the pipeline with overhead
20 high voltage transmission lines. I have submitted a
21 report from INGAA Foundation, which states the
22 criteria for a pipeline coexisting with electrical
23 power lines. The data of this report shows that the
24 proposed route is in their high-risk category.

25 Much has been said concerning job

1 creation of this corridor. If the corridor is
2 approved for a Minnesota location, how many
3 construction jobs would actually be given to
4 Minnesota residents? How many union pipeline
5 workers from outside of the area would come in? If
6 we're truly concerned about Minnesota employment,
7 they should require the pipeline be built with
8 U.S.-produced steel made with Minnesota taconite or
9 iron ore. Perhaps then we would not have had to
10 extend unemployment benefits.

11 In conclusion, you are being tasked with
12 evaluation of a new pipeline corridor, which may or
13 may not need to be located in Minnesota. The EIS
14 scoping should be done in conjunction with all
15 appropriately qualified authorities in the route
16 selection and should also be done with federal help
17 and coordination. It's too important a decision
18 with long-term consequences to clean water for the
19 citizens of Minnesota to be fragmented and
20 considered in isolation, or scoping it to meet the
21 narrow interests of a Canadian company.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Thank you very
24 much.

25 Claire Steen is the next person up. Mary

1 Johnson is on deck and Cynthia Janes is in the hole.

2 MS. CLAIRE STEEN: My name is Claire,
3 C-L-A-I-R-E, Steen, S-T-E-E-N.

4 My name is Claire Steen. I have a
5 residence in Upper Hay Lake which is north of Pequot
6 Lakes. Currently I am serving as president of the
7 Upper Hay Lake Association.

8 During my teaching career of 39 years, I
9 had the privilege of being a teacher at Pequot Lakes
10 High School for 32 years. When I first began
11 teaching at Pequot Lakes I was struck by the number
12 of families whose livelihood depended on the tourist
13 industry. Many parents had seasonal or full-time
14 employment at the local resorts. Their children, my
15 students, were employed during the summer working as
16 waitresses, busboys, dock hands, cabin cleaners, and
17 many other jobs. If you have ever traveled to the
18 Pequot Lakes area you know it is brimming with
19 visitors during the summer, enjoying our beautiful
20 lakes and activities that they offer.

21 If the Sandpiper Pipeline is built in the
22 current proposed route, it will stretch across
23 Minnesota's most beautiful and natural resource
24 areas including lakes, wetlands, and forests. It
25 will transport oil across our most precious

1 resource, which is water, to very little value for
2 local residents.

3 My fear is that if there is an oil spill,
4 there is absolutely no 100 percent guarantee that
5 our water will not be polluted. I have attended
6 several pipeline meetings and understand that 25
7 percent of the pipeline valves, which are used to
8 turn off sections of the pipeline in the case of a
9 spill, would be located in the Brainerd Lakes area.
10 Even so, the number of pipeline valves is no
11 guarantee that when our water is contaminated with
12 oil it will be totally removed.

13 With the 28 water crossings identified by
14 the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, we know that
15 it would be very difficult or take some time to
16 reach an oil spill should it occur. Any amount of
17 oil in our precious water would be an economic
18 disaster for our lake area.

19 I believe that our lake country in north
20 central Minnesota needs to be fully protected from
21 oil pipeline construction because of the history of
22 Enbridge that is a very real danger to our lakes,
23 wetlands, plants, wildlife and forests. I also urge
24 the State of Minnesota to develop a long-range plan
25 on dealing with pipeline issues so that our state is

1 always known as a Land of 10,000 Lakes.

2 It is my hope that grandchildren -- my
3 grandchildren and future generations will be able to
4 fish and enjoy our beautiful lakes as I have been
5 able to do.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Thank you very
8 much.

9 Mary Johnson is up, then Cynthia Janes,
10 and Robert Morgan is the last one to speak.

11 MS. MARY JOHNSON: Hello. Mary Johnson,
12 M-A-R-Y, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. And I've been a resident of
13 Minnesota for over 50 years and am currently living
14 in the rural Backus and Pine River area where I've
15 been living full time for 20 years.

16 Much attention in the press has been
17 given to the safety of oil traveling by rail, with
18 overt or covert suggestions that public safety is a
19 choice between rail or pipelines. This either/or
20 type of thinking is an example of the type of narrow
21 and only partially accurate information being
22 presented, in my opinion, to the public. If we want
23 to make rail traffic safer, then we should focus on
24 how to do that.

25 It is my understanding that North Dakota

1 had not been required to strip volatiles prior to
2 loading in rail cars. This resulted in a very low
3 flash point of 85 degrees Centigrade, resulting in
4 explosions during derailments. Generally,
5 unfortunately, companies do the minimum required by
6 law, not necessarily what is best for public safety.

7 Rail safety is certainly a separate issue
8 from choosing the best route for a pipeline. The
9 scoping for the EIS should be as broad as possible
10 and include all alternate routes, both within
11 Minnesota and, I would propose, outside of it.

12 For example, the Bakken North pipeline,
13 which is very near its final approval, this pipeline
14 would travel from Williston, North Dakota through
15 South Dakota and Iowa, ending in Patoka, Illinois.
16 If approved, the Bakken North will transport 450,000
17 barrels per day of Bakken crude. If Sandpiper is
18 collocated with this pipeline or approved in another
19 route with its 375,000 barrels per day, that
20 combined capacity would amount to 825,000 barrels
21 per day. The current Bakken production is slightly
22 more than one million barrels per day.

23 Rail shipments would be greatly reduced,
24 but never be eliminated, since refineries on the
25 East Coast that are not served by pipelines will

1 still require rail shipment. This fact has been
2 pointed out in public meetings by MPCA personnel but
3 seems to get ignored in the push to approve
4 pipelines. Even if Sandpiper is not approved in any
5 route, the decrease in rail shipments with this
6 Bakken North operating will be substantial.

7 Because the Sandpiper and Line 3 pipeline
8 corridor is not just a Minnesota project, the EIS
9 should be done with the assistance of federal
10 agencies that need to ultimately approve the
11 project. The pipeline scoping should be taking a
12 broad, not a piecemeal, approach in making the right
13 decision for the present and future citizens of
14 Minnesota, keeping in mind that clean water is a
15 safety issue for people as well.

16 Thank you.

17 And I did have some questions that
18 another person had addressed as well. And that is
19 more specifically questions about this oil coming
20 from Canada is passing through Minnesota, it's not
21 staying here, not originating here. The same with
22 the North Dakota Bakken oil. Not oil that is either
23 originating in Minnesota or staying in Minnesota.
24 And it seems to me that this is not -- should not be
25 looked at in isolation as a Minnesota project.

1 Isn't -- coming from Canada, isn't that
2 an interborder situation? And then certainly with
3 these other states involved, it should be an
4 interstate. So I don't understand why the emphasis
5 seems to be on Minnesota, Minnesota, Minnesota, it
6 has to go through here. That's one of my additional
7 questions.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Thank you very
10 much for your comments.

11 Go ahead.

12 MS. CYNTHIA JANES: My name is Cynthia
13 Janes, C-Y-N-T-H-I-A, the last name is Janes,
14 J-A-N-E-S, like Janesville, Wisconsin.

15 I am a snowbird. I live in the Brainerd
16 Lakes area from April through November. Like many
17 snowbirds, my roots in this area go deep. My
18 great-grandfather worked at the Northern Pacific
19 shop in Brainerd in the late 1800s. My great-uncle
20 turned the weekly Brainerd Dispatch into the daily
21 paper it still is.

22 Every year my family and I drive or fly
23 thousands of miles to return to the pristine beauty
24 of north central Minnesota. We do this not because
25 we have nowhere else to go, not because we don't

1 like it where we live the rest of the year, not
2 because there aren't other beautiful places in this
3 great country of ours, but because of our deep and
4 enduring love for these rivers and streams, these
5 lakes, these trees, these birds and animals, as well
6 as the wonderful people who live here full time.
7 Yes, our presence helps the area economically. But
8 we could do so much more.

9 I'm just glad that I'm able to speak
10 today because I'm already back. It would be nice if
11 you could have one of these in Brainerd in the
12 summer.

13 Now we find that what we value most is at
14 risk. The very integrity of our natural
15 environment. My primary concern is that the
16 cost-benefit analysis of this proposal does not
17 work. We are asked to place into our pristine soil,
18 conduit that will transport highly hazardous
19 material from Canada and North Dakota through the
20 state of Minnesota. Minnesota will not benefit from
21 this oil, it doesn't start here or end here. There
22 will be short-term gains, monetary, for property
23 owners, elected officials, and temporary workers
24 constructing the pipeline. That's about it as far
25 as benefits for Minnesota.

1 What are the risks for Minnesota? A
2 buried pipeline can pollute soil and water, as is
3 evidenced by the numerous leaks that have already
4 occurred in Enbridge's current Line 2 pipeline. We
5 cannot afford to defile the sensitive environment of
6 north central Minnesota.

7 Donald Trump, in The Art of the Deal,
8 wrote as one of his rules, protect your downside.
9 In this case we cannot protect our downside. The
10 downside is perpetual risk of leakage that is
11 forever. When a deal has an unprotectible downside,
12 one should walk away. No pipeline in the lakes
13 area.

14 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Thank you very
15 much for your comments.

16 Robert. Go ahead, sir.

17 MR. ROBERT MORGAN: My name is Robert
18 Morgan, R-O-B-E-R-T, M-O-R-G-A-N. I live in the
19 Fort Ripley/St. Mathias area just south of Brainerd.

20 Some points I'd like to address on this
21 project are that I grew up on a small farm in
22 central Minnesota in a home without hot running
23 water, associated utilities that are taken for
24 granted by most Minnesota residents in the 21st
25 Century. About age 6, I had my earliest close

1 encounter with the work involved in extracting
2 groundwater. Many times my brother and I had to
3 pump water for hours by hand for our cows and other
4 farm animals. We took turns pumping that steel
5 handle up and down to lift gallons of cold, clear
6 water over 100 feet to the surface. When the pump
7 rods and leathers needed repair, I helped pull the
8 rods and could see at a young age how difficult it
9 was to obtain water. It is and always will be one
10 of the most precious commodities needed by humans.

11 I am opposed to the toxic contamination
12 of a wide swath of Minnesota lake country as
13 proposed in the planned transit of crude oil by the
14 Enbridge Pipeline Corporation. The extreme
15 disturbance on an intact, high-quality resource
16 that's unwarranted from reasonable alternative
17 options for resource procurement exists. Just
18 recently we had proclamations for funding for clean
19 water and responsible stewardship by Governor
20 Dayton. I think this shows that the general public
21 is very concerned about water in Minnesota.

22 The statements that should be addressed
23 in the scoping include value versus costs and ought
24 not to be misunderstood there. There is a need to
25 fully analyze the potential impact of the design and

1 operation of the proposed pipeline on the landscape
2 and the community resources through which it passes.

3 As a corporation, Enbridge has criteria
4 other than this -- than the betterment of the
5 communities on which they are focused. Like their
6 concern about the profits because they're financial
7 stakeholders. There is a long history of companies
8 such as Enbridge using selective dialogue in their
9 statements and reports to convince jurisdictional
10 administrators to approve their actions. There were
11 scientists hired associated with the Trans-Alaska
12 pipeline whose direction mandate was to collect data
13 and justify getting the pipeline and corridor
14 approved, not being directed to lie, just to focus
15 on information that increased the likelihood that
16 the project would be approved by an administrator.
17 There is definitely a need to look at the wording
18 and throughout all the statement that is made and to
19 see if we're looking at the same thing.

20 The pipeline companies often claim they
21 can clean up contaminated water so it has only a few
22 parts per million of toxins. And what is the cost
23 to people's health compared to the bottom line of
24 profits of faceless corporations? Using the fear
25 factor of health of people that may be hurt by an

1 oil train explosion, this is the basic point of
2 protection for safe, original water sources.

3 I worked in Alaska a few years and saw
4 how the pipeline changed the landscape in the
5 resident communities. Can we learn from these
6 errors? Every year there are many oil spills that
7 the general public is unaware of or does not even
8 comprehend how they adversely affect humans, let
9 alone the food chain. We can and we should do
10 better in siting, design, and operating these lines.
11 I hope that is addressed in this document.

12 Let us address the so-called emotional
13 response of citizens being against the Enbridge
14 proposal. It may seem that these people speaking up
15 against the proposed Sandpiper route are somehow
16 mesmerized by the threat of having the north central
17 lake landscape despoiled and exposed to toxic
18 spills. A closer analysis would indicate that it is
19 the oil consortiums that are covering for the
20 excessive greed of their stakeholders. The
21 discussion of how much the alternative options or
22 environmental protection required is the emotional
23 response to the greed of those who seek mainly to
24 benefit financially with minimal regard for local
25 communities and water quality.

1 It is a privilege to have options to
2 cheap oil products. In Minnesota, it should be a
3 right to have access to abundant and clean water.

4 Thank you very much. Would you like this
5 copy?

6 COURT REPORTER: Yes, please.

7 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: To the question
8 regarding the permit required at the federal level,
9 and for Line 3, Line 3 is already existing and
10 coming in. And that presidential permit does not
11 need to be renewed because they're not exceeding --
12 the company would not be exceeding what they were
13 permitted in terms of capacity. So that's why the
14 presidential permit piece of this does not have to
15 be reevaluated. That would be reevaluated at the
16 State Department and not by the state.

17 And as the other complications of
18 coordinating with the other states, to the extent
19 that these portions of -- these projects have
20 already been permitted in other states, we will be
21 using that information and utilizing the information
22 in those other states' EISs that have been done
23 currently for these projects, the permitting is done
24 state by state. And I understand that that is not a
25 logical way to proceed with such a project, but that

1 is the system that is in place for the permitting of
2 these projects.

3 What we have to do in Minnesota is make
4 sure that the piece that's coming from Minnesota,
5 that we are fully evaluating the alternatives and
6 the impact of those alternatives that have come up
7 through the scoping processes. That's not to say
8 that the issue -- there will be federal permits, the
9 company will have to apply for those federal
10 permits, but that is done -- again, that will be
11 done not separately, actually, but they will be
12 actually using the states' EIS.

13 So they do still have to get those
14 permits from other agencies, state and federal
15 agencies, it's just not coordinated through this
16 particular EIS. And that's where we're at on that.
17 I know that that's not a very rewarding answer to
18 your question, but --

19 MS. MARY JOHNSON: I'm sure it gets very
20 complicated with all of these interrelated
21 approvals, et cetera.

22 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes.

23 MS. MARY JOHNSON: But isn't it still an
24 option that we would not have to accept a pipeline
25 through Minnesota if we -- if these other pipelines

1 are carrying the oil, why would we have to have it
2 come through Minnesota, necessarily?

3 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Well, the state
4 would still be obligated to assess those
5 applications just to make a determination on those
6 applications one way or the other, to either approve
7 it or deny it. The state still has to go through
8 the process of evaluating --

9 MS. MARY JOHNSON: But, I mean, it isn't
10 a given just because someone wants to put a pipeline
11 here.

12 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: No, not at all.

13 MS. MARY JOHNSON: Looking at the broader
14 picture, is this an appropriate state to have a
15 pipeline come through with all of our water
16 resources, as opposed to states that don't have
17 10,000 lakes plus, et cetera. The wonderful water
18 resources we have in our state.

19 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Well, and that is
20 why those alternatives that are on the map, those
21 alternatives will be looked at in the context of
22 that.

23 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Is there anyone
24 who would like to make a second comment? Are there
25 people that would like to make comments? I know

1 there's a hand here, but did I see another hand
2 earlier?

3 Why don't you come up and give your name.
4 And we'll still have that same five-minute time
5 frame.

6 MR. MIKE FRANKLIN: All right. Thank
7 you.

8 My name is Mike Franklin, and I represent
9 the Minnesota Ag Energy Alliance. It's kind of an
10 unusual coalition that's come together well over two
11 years now to support these projects, the proposals.
12 Our allies include members or companies or
13 organizations including the Minnesota Petroleum
14 Marketers Association, the Minnesota Farm Bureau,
15 Minnesota Power, the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce,
16 the Minnesota Agri Group Council, the Minnesota
17 Retailers Association, the United Association
18 representing pipefitters, welders, plumbers, service
19 technicians, the Minnesota Service Station
20 Convenience Store Association, the Midwest Food
21 Processors Association, and many others that have
22 come together, like I said, well over two years ago
23 to ensure a fair and final evaluation preferably on
24 Minnesota's usual process for evaluating these
25 things. That has not happened.

1 The alliance, though, the Minnesota Ag
2 Energy Alliance is pleased that this process, the
3 scoping process for the Sandpiper and Line 3
4 replacement project, is going forward. A fair and
5 final evaluation of these projects has been delayed
6 for far too long and unnecessarily.

7 Sandpiper and Line 3 will ensure the safe
8 delivery of abundant, dependable energy that's vital
9 to heating Minnesota's homes, fueling cars and
10 airplanes, and generating electricity for
11 residential and industrial use, far more than for
12 the benefit of one company. In fact, together these
13 projects will create 3,000 construction jobs while
14 providing a \$2.3 billion boost to Minnesota's
15 economy. And that's not my words, that's an
16 analysis that was done by the Bureau of Business and
17 Economic Research at the University of Minnesota -
18 Duluth Labovitz School. And that study in fact
19 found a \$138 million benefit for the 15-county
20 region in hospitality alone. In fact, every dollar
21 spent on these projects in construction yields
22 another 41 cents in spending elsewhere in the
23 economy.

24 So, in other words, these projects don't
25 just benefit one company or even the people who are

1 working to build them while they're building them,
2 but realistically benefit many, many more people
3 than that who are here in our state full time.

4 In addition, when the projects are
5 complete they will generate \$25 million annually in
6 Minnesota property taxes, and that's just after the
7 first year of operations of Sandpiper.

8 For all these reasons and many others,
9 it's very critical that we keep these projects
10 moving forward and the process on a predictable and
11 timely path that yields an outcome that is fair and
12 final.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Thank you very
15 much.

16 Okay. Are there any additional comments?
17 Any folks who would like to make a comment?

18 Jamie, any closing thoughts? What are
19 sort of the next steps through this.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: Are you closing this to
21 any other questions?

22 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: No, we'll be happy
23 to answer questions. We will close this formal
24 portion of the meeting now and staff will be here,
25 we will be here until 9:00, we'll be happy to answer

1 any questions you have until 9:00.

2 Thanks, everyone, for coming out. I
3 appreciate it.

4 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: One more piece.
5 If folks want to come up and make comments again
6 privately to Janet, she's also here until 9:00. So
7 you can get your comments into the minutes at that
8 point in time.

9 Any other final process questions?
10 Thoughts?

11 Thank you very much for coming out
12 tonight.

13 Question?

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Well, I could clarify
15 later, I wanted to understand the experience of the
16 Department of Commerce in running the actual EIS.
17 You can do it later on.

18 MS. MARY JOHNSON: No, that's a good
19 question, we'd like to all hear that.

20 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: He was asking the
21 role of the Department of Commerce. Okay, the red
22 light is on. Let me try this again.

23 The gentleman was asking what the role
24 was of the Department of Commerce in its
25 relationship to the environmental impact statement.

1 Test, test. Now it's working.

2 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Sure. The Energy
3 Environmental Review and Analysis unit is a small
4 unit within Commerce and we serve as technical staff
5 to the Public Utilities Commission. And as
6 typically is done for these projects, a transmission
7 project or in this case of a pipeline, we are the
8 group that's tasked with doing the environmental
9 review for these projects.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

11 MS. MARY JOHNSON: Related to that, what
12 is the role of Cardno, is it, that is doing -- what
13 are they doing and how did you procure them to do
14 this? And what are their qualifications for doing
15 the work that they're going to be doing? Could you
16 explain that to the folks here?

17 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Again, the
18 question -- hang on a second. The question was what
19 is the role of Cardno in this process and what are
20 their qualifications.

21 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Sure. There was a
22 request for proposals that was put out by the state
23 last summer. We received -- the state received
24 numerous -- I wouldn't say numerous proposals, but
25 there were several proposals that were evaluated and

1 that is how that consultant was selected. They will
2 be serving as -- Cardno will be serving as technical
3 staff to our staff.

4 MS. MARY JOHNSON: And what are their
5 qualifications and how many of these types of EISs
6 have they done in the past?

7 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Again, the
8 question was qualifications and the number of EISs
9 that they've done.

10 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: They've done
11 numerous environmental impact statements. If you
12 wanted to get a list of those, you would have to
13 contact the contracting department to get more
14 detailed information. If your question is really
15 related to the contracting portion of this, that is
16 something that you would have to definitely contact
17 the contract unit for.

18 MS. MARY JOHNSON: Cardno or --

19 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: For the Department
20 of Commerce.

21 MS. MARY JOHNSON: The DOC?

22 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes.

23 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Any additional
24 questions?

25 MR. LYNN ENGLEHORN: What happens to the

1 easement when the pipeline is abandoned like this
2 might be one. Is that easement maintained or is it
3 abandoned?

4 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: I'm sorry, sir.
5 Could you tell me your name?

6 MR. LYNN ENGLEHORN: Lynn Englehorn.
7 L-Y-N-N, E-N-G-L-E-H-O-R-N.

8 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: So in this case
9 this question would pertain to Line 3 because Line 3
10 is proposed to be replaced. The existing Line 3
11 would remain in place where it is currently and the
12 proposal would be for that line to be completely
13 cleaned out and cut off from any other sources when
14 the new Line 3 was to be in service. And then the
15 right-of-way would be maintained, there's cathodic
16 protection for that, and the corridor will still be
17 maintained.

18 MR. LYNN ENGLEHORN: Okay.

19 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Anything else?
20 Hang on. Do you want to use this? And I'll give
21 her this microphone.

22 MS. MARY JOHNSON: I view this as an
23 educational session as well as giving our views.

24 That brings up the question about these
25 pipelines that are retired, abandoned, whatever you

1 want to term it. Why are they left in the ground?
2 Is there anyplace where they, you know, have laws or
3 whatever where they would have to remove these,
4 these companies, after they're done with them,
5 rather than just leaving them there? Do you know if
6 there's, you know, anyplace where they aren't
7 allowed to just leave them?

8 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: The answer to that
9 question I don't know specifically, but the proposal
10 that is in place is in compliance with existing
11 federal rules from the PHMSA, the Pipeline Hazardous
12 Materials Safety group, with the federal agency, so
13 their proposal, that proposal for the deactivation
14 is consistent and complies with the existing federal
15 rules.

16 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: A few more
17 questions? We've got time here.

18 MS. COLLEEN LEBLANC: Colleen LeBlanc,
19 C-O-L-L-E-E-N, L-E-B-L-A-N-C.

20 I'm just wondering, and maybe you can't
21 answer this, but the gentleman who had talked about
22 an organization of many groups of people and the job
23 numbers and the revenue numbers and all the numbers,
24 I'm just wondering over what period of time that
25 covers? Like has an analysis been done on the

1 economic impacts of, okay, so we have so many jobs,
2 but how long do they last? And we have people who
3 have come in and build a pipeline, they're all gone,
4 so I'm not quite understanding how that's -- what
5 kind of economic impact that is.

6 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: The economic
7 impact will be covered fully in the EIS. That would
8 include the economic impact of building the
9 pipeline, the construction aspect of it, the
10 long-term impact, job impacts associated with it.
11 As well as looking at the regional economies that
12 someone else brought up, in terms of importance to
13 the local and regional economies. So that will all
14 be looked at in detail. So we have not done that
15 analysis yet so I cannot answer that question at
16 this point.

17 MR. CHUCK PARINS: Chuck Parins, P, as in
18 Peter, A-R-I-N-S.

19 And I'm just wondering, as part of the
20 process of the EIS, I didn't see anything in there
21 about conditions. Or is that another phase where
22 they may say, similar to the question previously, I
23 mean, the testing regimen and protocols, and do they
24 establish those in an EIS, or things like
25 removing --

1 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: I'm not
2 understanding your question. What conditions are
3 you referring to, specifically?

4 MR. CHUCK PARINS: Things that they might
5 be required to do if a certain alternative was
6 chosen. They have their own testing protocols, but
7 I don't know if that is included in the EIS, or is
8 that a phase later in specifications or something
9 like that?

10 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Are you talking
11 specifically construction?

12 MR. CHUCK PARINS: Quality assurance,
13 construction as well as into the future if a certain
14 alternative is picked, does the EIS have any impact
15 at this stage on that, writing specifications or
16 providing conditions into the future if it's a
17 foregone conclusion that the actual pipeline is
18 going to come through Minnesota?

19 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: That's a really
20 good question. The EIS will look at the impacts of
21 constructing a pipeline in Minnesota on the
22 alternatives that get carried forward in the EIS.
23 So first that will happen.

24 They will also have to look at avoidance,
25 minimization, and other ways that we can mitigate

1 that impact. And some of those mitigation things
2 that you're talking about in the future would come
3 through the permit conditions. So if the project is
4 permitted, then there would be a whole suite of
5 permit conditions that would go along with that that
6 would be very route specific.

7 MR. CHUCK PARINS: Okay. That's good to
8 know.

9 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: So I think the
10 general construction aspect, what you're referring
11 to, is going to be similar across all alternatives.
12 However, for any given alternative, there would be
13 very specific mitigation that could occur to
14 mitigate, you know, any environmental impacts. I
15 can't even begin to go into all the details. But,
16 for example, crossing a stream, very specific things
17 that we can put into a permit that have conditions
18 that go for the life of the permit.

19 MR. CHUCK PARINS: Thank you.

20 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: And I'd like to
21 say that that's not just, you know, that would be a
22 permit with the state. There will also have to be
23 permits issued by DNR, there will also be very
24 specific conditions for any permit that would be
25 issued for this project. But, again, I can't say

1 specifically what those would be until we actually
2 would know if the project is permitted and along
3 which route.

4 MR. CHUCK PARINS: Thank you.

5 MR. CHARLIE PETERSEN: Any additional
6 questions?

7 All right. First of all, thank you very
8 much for your time this evening. Thank you very
9 much for your comments. I thank Janet and Jamie and
10 the folks here for their responses.

11 We'll be around for roughly about the
12 next hour until 9:00. Again, we'll sort of reopen
13 the open house aspect. If you've got questions,
14 raise them. We'll be here as long as you're here up
15 until 9:00. Thanks.

16 (Private comment.)

17 MR. JERRY RYAN: Jerry Ryan, R-Y-A-N.
18 Pipeliners Local Union 798. I should say I
19 represent Pipeliners Local Union 798.

20 The Sandpiper and Line 3 projects will be
21 constructed using modern, high strength steel pipe
22 and fusion-bond coating. Waterways and
23 environmentally sensitive areas will be left
24 undisturbed with the use of directional drilling.
25 When placed in service, these pipelines will become

1 a safe, silent, and unseen means to transport crude
2 oil.

3 Thank you. I appreciate your help.

4 (Meeting concluded.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25